

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MARIA DEL CARMEN CORTES-REYES,
Plaintiff,
v.
ENRIQUE HERRERA CARRASCO, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00323-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 13]

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to extend discovery deadlines for 90 days. Docket No. 13.

A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). "The diligence obligation is ongoing." *Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D. Ariz. 2012). The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the entire period of time already allowed. *See Muniz v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 731 F.Supp.2d 961, 967 (N. D. Cal. 2010) (quoting *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 605, 607 (E. D. Cal. 1999)). That a request is jointly submitted "neither mandates allowance of the extension sought nor exempts parties from making the necessary showings to justify that relief. Failure to provide such showings may result in denial of a stipulated request to extend the case management deadlines." *Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1178 (D. Nev. 2022)

Here, the parties have failed to demonstrate diligence. The Court issued the scheduling order in this case on March 31, 2025. Docket No. 10. The parties have conducted little affirmative discovery. Docket No. 13 at 2.

